

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/710,907  
Docket No.: 13418-US-PA

**REMARKS**

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding nonfinal Office Action mailed Feb. 9, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1-17 are respectfully requested.

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102**

Claims 1, 7, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Abe et al. (US 5,705,879, hereinafter Abe).

In response thereto, Applicants hereby otherwise traverse these rejections. As such, Applicants submit that the present invention as set forth in claim 1 and its dependent claims 7, 10 and 11 is novel and unobvious over Abe, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed.

With respect to claim 1, as originally filed, recites in part:

A LCD lighting control system, comprising:

...

**a self-oscillation inverter ...;**

**a sampling-frequency generating circuit, coupled to the self-oscillation inverter ...;**

**a detecting-feedback circuit ...; and**

**a modulator, coupled to the detecting-feedback circuit, the sampling-frequency generating circuit and the self-oscillation circuit ...**

(Emphasis added)

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/710,907  
Docket No.: 13418-US-PA

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner relied on Fig. 9 of Abe. The Examiner interpreted items 16 and 18 as a whole for teaching the self-oscillation inverter, while the Examiner further interpreted the same, i.e., items 16 and 18 as a whole, again for teaching the sampling-frequency generating circuit. Applicants submit such interpretation is not appropriate.

It is held that “[A] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference” and “[T]he element must be arranged as required by the claim”. MPEP §2131.

Therefore, when interpreted as reading simultaneously on the self-oscillation inverter and the sampling-frequency generating circuit, items 16 and 18 as a whole would not deem to anticipate them regarding to the arrangement limitation of the self-oscillation inverter and the sampling-frequency, that is “a sampling-frequency generating circuit, coupled to the self-oscillation inverter”, because one cannot be coupled to itself.

Similarly, interpreting items 22 and 26 as a whole as reading on both of the detecting-feedback circuit and the modulator is also inappropriate. Such an interpretation clearly teaches other than the arrangement limitation of “a modulator, coupled to the detecting-feedback circuit, the sampling-frequency generating circuit and the self-oscillation circuit”.

Therefore, Abe fails to teach each and every element arranged as required by claim 1. As such, claim 1 and its dependent claims 7, 10 and 11 are submitted to be novel and unobvious over Abe, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed.

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/710,907  
Docket No.: 13418-US-PA

**Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 8, 9, 12, and 14-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Abe in view of Lin et al. (US 7,057,611, hereinafter Lin).

In response thereto, Applicants hereby otherwise traverse the rejection, and submit that the present invention as set forth in claim 12 and its dependent claims 14-17 is novel and unobvious over Abe, Lin, or any of the other cited references, taken alone or in combination, and thus should be allowed. Further claims 8 and 9 depend on allowable independent claim 1, and thus should also be allowed.

Applicants submit that claim 12 contains all limitations presented in claim 1 including those discussed above as bringing patentable weight to claim 1. Such limitations, e.g., “a sampling-frequency generating circuit, coupled to the self-oscillation inverter”, and “a modulator, coupled to the detecting-feedback circuit, the sampling-frequency generating circuit and the self-oscillation circuit” are neither taught, disclosed, nor suggested by Abe, Lin, or any of the other cited references.

Therefore claim 12 and its dependent claims 14-17 are submitted to be allowable.

**Allowable Subject Matters**

Claims 2-6 and 13 are indicated as would be allowable, but objected as the base claims on which claims 2-6 and 13 depend were rejected.

Applicants submit that claims 1 and 12 are now as allowable as discussed above. As such, claims 2-6, and 13 which are unchanged from their originally allowable form should be allowable in their current forms.

Customer No.: 31561  
Application No.: 10/710,907  
Docket No.: 13418-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that the pending claims 1-17 are in proper condition for allowance and an action to such effect is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date :

May 4, 2007

Belinda Lee  
Belinda Lee

Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor-1, No. 100  
Roosevelt Road, Section 2  
Taipei, 100  
Taiwan  
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800  
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233  
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw  
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw